The JS 44 civil cover sheet at the contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. It is the purpose of initiating the civil dockersheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

	'			,					
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS RAEKWON WILSON				DEFENDANTS CITY OF PHILADE	ELPHIA, et	बा है। बा	31818		
(b) County of Residence o	f First Listed Plaintiff XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	PHILADELPHIA (SES)	\rightarrow		(IN U.S. P.	LAINTIFF CASES O	,)	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Michael Pileggi 303 Chestnut Street, Phil (215) 627-8516	•	r)		Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISM	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box-Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES			
U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State		Incorporated or Pri		PTF	DEF
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2 🗖 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A		□ 5	□ 5
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation		O 6	1 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		**			Province and the second	PER POSCO	I ogreen o	170 A 270 A 270 A	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Fraud Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee Conditions of	TY	DREITURE/PENALTY 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Raiitway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	422 Appe	SC 157 TY RIGHTS rights t tmark SECURITY 1395ff) Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g)) LITAX SUITS (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	375 False Cla 400 State Rei 410 Antitrust 430 Banks ar 450 Commer 460 Deportat 470 Racketee Corrupt 0 480 Consum 490 Cable/Sa 850 Securitie Exchang 891 Agricult 893 Environr 895 Freedom Act 896 Arbitrati 899 Adminis	apportionm ind Banking cer influence organizatio er Credit it TV ss/Commod ge atutory Acts mental Matt of Informa on trative Proc ew or Appe Decision tionality of	ed and ons lities/ tions ters ation
	moved from	Appellate Court	J 4 Reins Reop	ened Another (specify)	District	☐ 6 Multidistri Litigation	ct		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Brief description of ca	use:	e filing <i>(D</i>	o not cite jurisdictional statu	utes unless div	ersity):			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	Police Misconduct CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 23	IS A CLASS ACTION	DI	EMAND \$		HECK YES only i	f demanded in o	complaint:	:
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY									
DATE 6/26/14		SIGNATURE OF ATT	NY O	FRECORD	DOCKE	JUN 2	26 2014	\supset	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		ywnaet	100	761					
RECEIPT # AN	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	GE		

UNITED STATES DIST Case 2:14-cv-03932-TON Document 1						
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to I						
Address of Plaintiff: 5524 Greenway Ave Pulled	labina PA 14 3932					
Address of Defendant: 15\$5 Arch 8 West Philadel	who PA					
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: 55 45 \$ Spring Celcl A	Venne Philadelphia PA					
(Use Reverse Side For A	Additional Space)					
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation a						
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)	Yes No No					
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes No No					
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:						
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:					
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:						
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year.	_ / _ /					
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior saction in this court?	Yes□ No□ suit pending or within one year previously terminated					
	Yes No C					
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier reminated action in this court?						
terminated action in this coun?	Yes No.					
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil righ	ts case filed by the same individual					
	Yes No P					
CIVIL: (Place / in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)						
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:					
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts					
2. □ FELA	2. Airplane Personal Injury					
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation					
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury					
5. Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury					
6. Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)					
7. Civil Rights	7. Products Liability					
8. 🗆 Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos					
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases					
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)					
11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)						
ADDITD ATION CERT	IEIC ATION					
ARBITRATION CERT (Check Appropriate Co						
I,, counsel of record do hereby certif						
□ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; □ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of					
DATE:						
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#					
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the	ere has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.					
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or	within one-year previously terminated action in this court					
except as noted above.						
DATE: 6/26/14 MICHAEL PILEGOI	JUN 26 2014 <u>) 61558</u>					
/ Attorney-at-Law CIV. 609 (5/2012)	Attorney I.D.#					

Case 2:14-cv-03932-TON Document 1 Filed 06/26/14 Page 3 of 12

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

50N
•

CIVIL ACTION

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, et. al.

NO. 14

Sto Page

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

- (a) Habeas Corpus Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.
- (b) Social Security Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.
- (c) Arbitration Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ()
- (d) Asbestos Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.
- (e) Special Management Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)
- (f) Standard Management Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.

(%

Date 016 607 8616

215-627-5105

Attorney for

Telephone FAX Number E-Mail Address

(Civ. 660) 10/02







IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RAEKWON WILSON

Plaintiff

: JURY TRIAL **DEMAND** VS.

3932

THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, PHILADELPHIA:

POLICE OFFICER GREEN, BADGE # 1613: PHILADELPHIA POLICE OFFICER SMITH,

BADGE # 1782, individually and as police officers : C.A. No. 14-

for the City of Philadelphia

Defendants

COMPLAINT

:

I. JURISDICTION

1. This action is brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343(1),(3),(4) and the aforementioned statutory provision.

II. PARTIES

- 2. Plaintiff, Raekwon Wilson is an adult male who was at all times relevant to this Complaint, a resident of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- 3. Defendant City of Philadelphia is a City of the First Class in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and at all times relevant hereto operated under the color of state law in creating and maintaining a Police Department, was the employer of all Defendants and had the responsibility of adopting policies, implementing procedures and practices which would create an environment whereby citizens would be safe from police abuse.

- 4. Defendant Green, badge number 1613, is and was at all times relevant to this Complaint, a police officer for the City of Philadelphia and is acting under the color of state law. He is being sued in both his individual and official capacities.
- 5. Defendant Smith, badge number 1782, is and was at all times relevant to this Complaint, a police officer for the City of Philadelphia and is acting under the color of state law. He is being sued in both his individual and official capacities

III. FACTS

- 6. On or about May 31, 2014, Plaintiff and two friends were walking to a barber shop located at 55th and Chester Avenue when a police car driving toward them suddenly stopped next to them.
- 7. Without reason, cause or justification, Defendant Smith exited the passenger side of the police vehicle and ran toward Plaintiff.
- 8. The Plaintiff became frightened and started to run being chased by Defendant Smith before he stopped, turned around and put his hands in the air.
- 9. Defendant Smith then without reason, cause or justification punched Plaintiff in his right jaw.
- 10. Plaintiff fell backwards hitting a step to a house, landing on his back and head. He temporarily lost consciousness.
- 11. Defendants handcuffed Plaintiff, searched him and placed him in the police vehicle. Plaintiff was not in possession of any contraband or weapons.
- 12. Plaintiff sat in the police vehicle handcuffed for approximately ten (10) minutes before Defendants released him. Plaintiff at that time informed the Defendants that he was injured by Defendants during his arrest.

- 13. Plaintiff went to Mercy Philadelphia Hospital where he was treated for injuries to his head and back.
- 14. Plaintiff received a CAT scan and X-rays and released. Plaintiff continues to be treated for his injuries.
- 15. The foregoing conduct of the Defendants, acting under the color of state law, was undertaken in concert and conspiracy and as part of an effort to unlawful arrest and assault and otherwise deprive Plaintiff of his civil and constitutional rights including Plaintiff's rights, privileges and immunities under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 16. At no time did Plaintiff strike, attempt to strike or intend to strike any of the Defendant police officers or any other police officer. At no time did Plaintiff harass, threaten, resist arrest in any way, commit any illegal acts or engage in any conduct, which in any way justified the actions of all Defendant police officers.
- 17. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' actions, Plaintiff suffered serious physical injury, including head and back injuries, as well as lacerations and contusions on his head and body.
- 18. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' actions, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer serious mental anguish, psychological and emotional distress, and pain and suffering, some or all of which may be permanent.
- 19. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' actions, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer damage to his personal and business reputation.

- 20. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' actions, Plaintiff was subjected to physical and verbal abuse without just or probable cause.
 - 21. At no time did Plaintiff pose a threat to Defendants or to others.
- 22. The actions of Defendants were undertaken in a menacing and arbitrary manner, designed to cause Plaintiff fear, distress and embarrassment.
- 23. The acts of Defendants were committed willfully, wantonly, maliciously, intentionally, outrageously, deliberately and/or by conduct so egregious as to shock the conscience.
- 24. The acts and omissions of the undivided Defendants were committed without cautious regard to due care, and with such wanton and reckless disregard of the consequences as to show Defendants' indifference to the danger of harm and injury.
- 25. The individual Defendants conspired to inflict harm on Plaintiff and deprive him constitutional rights.
- 26. Defendants made statements to police, the district attorney and others in order to conceal their unlawful and unconstitutional conduct and in an attempt to deny Plaintiff access to the Courts and to due process.
- 27. Defendants engaged in the aforesaid conduct for the purpose of violating Plaintiff's constitutional rights by subjecting him to excessive use of force and to due process.
- 28. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' illegal and unconstitutional actions, Plaintiff suffered pain, fear, anxiety, embarrassment, loss of liberty, confinement, physical injuries, severe emotional trauma, and the loss of the enjoyment of life, all to his great detriment and loss.

29. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants' illegal and unconstitutional actions, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer financial loss and deprivation of other liberty interests to his great financial detriment and loss.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

- 30. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-29 inclusive, are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.
- 31. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' above described unlawful and malicious conduct, committed under the color of state law, and while acting in that capacity, the Defendants deprived Plaintiff of the equal protection of the laws and Plaintiff's rights, privileges and immunities under the laws and the Constitution of the United States, Plaintiff's right to be free from excessive force, unlawful arrest, to be secure in one's person and property, to access to the Courts, and to due process and equal protection of the law, all to Plaintiff's great detriment and loss. As a result, Plaintiff suffered grievous harm, in violation of his rights under the laws and Constitution of the United States in particular the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments thereof, and 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
- 32. As a direct and proximate result of the acts and omissions of Defendants, Plaintiff was forced to endure great pain and mental suffering, and was deprived of physical liberty, all to Plaintiff's great detriment and loss.
- 33. The City of Philadelphia permitted, encouraged, tolerated, ratified and was deliberately indifferent to a pattern, practice and custom of:
 - a. Unjustified, unreasonable and illegal use of force by police officers;

- b. Unlawful arrest by police officers;
- c. Abuse of police powers, including harassment, improper searches and unreasonable force by police officers;
- d. Psychologically or emotionally unfit persons serving as police officers; and
- e. Failure of police officers to prevent, deter, report or take action against the unlawful conduct of police officers under such circumstances as presented herein.
- 34. Defendant, City of Philadelphia was deliberately indifferent to the need to:
 - a. Test its officers for emotional and psychological fitness to serve as police officers;
 - b. Monitor officers whom it knew or should have known were suffering from emotional and/or psychological problems that impair their ability to function as police officers;
 - c. Train its police officers in the appropriate exercise of police powers;
 - d. Facilitated, encouraged, tolerated, ratified, and/or was deliberately indifferent to officers using their status as police officers to have persons assaulted, or to achieve ends not reasonably related to their police duties; and
 - e. Failure to properly train, supervise and discipline officer officers with regard to such police practices.
- 35. The City of Philadelphia was deliberately indifferent to the need for more or different training, supervision, investigation or discipline in the areas of:

- a. Use of force by police;
- b. Unlawful arrests by police;
- c. Exercise of police powers;
- d. Police officers with emotional or psychological problems; and
- e. Police officers use of their status as police officers to have persons assaulted, or to achieve ends not reasonably related to their police duties.
- 36. The City of Philadelphia failed to properly sanction or discipline officers, who are aware of and conceal and/or aid and abet violations of constitutional rights of citizens by other police officers, thereby causing and encouraging police officers, including the Defendant police officers in this case, to violate the rights of citizens such as Plaintiff.
- 37. The foregoing acts, omissions, systemic deficiencies and deliberate indifference to the danger or harm to citizens like the Plaintiff and the need for more or different training, investigation and discipline are policies and customs of the City of Philadelphia and have caused police officers, including Defendant police officers in this case, to believe that they can violate the rights of citizens, with impunity, including the use of fraud and falsehood and to believe that such conduct would be honestly and properly investigated, all with the foreseeable result that officers are more likely to violate the constitutional rights of citizens.
- 38. The actions of all Defendants, acting under the color of state law and/or in concert or conspiracy with each other, deprived Plaintiff of his rights, privileges and immunities under the laws and Constitution of the United States, in particular, the

rights to be secure in one's person and property, to be free from excessive use of force, unlawful arrest and to due process of law.

- 39. Defendants City of Philadelphia and the individual named Defendants, acting in concert and conspiracy with each other, have by the aforementioned actions deprived Plaintiff of his constitutional and statutory rights.
- 40. By these actions, all Defendants have deprived Plaintiff of his rights secured by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

PUNITIVE DAMAGES

- 41. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1-40 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 42. The conduct of the individual Defendants was outrageous, malicious, wanton, willful, reckless and intentionally designed to inflict harm upon Plaintiff.
- 43. As a result of the acts of the individual Defendants alleged in the preceding paragraphs, Plaintiff is entitled to punitive damages as to each cause of action.

JURY DEMAND

44. Plaintiff demands a jury trial as to each Defendant and as to each count.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests the following relief:

- a. Compensatory damages;
- b. Punitive damages;
- c. A declaratory judgment that the practices and policies complained of are unconstitutional;
- d. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs; and

e. Such other and further relief as appears reasonable and just.

DATED: 6/26/14

MICHAEL PILEGOI, ESQUIRE

303 Chestnut Street Philadelphia, PA 19106 Counsel for Plaintiff